



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In a suggestive passage, the author states that our own age is in reaction against the Victorian Age, as was Euripides against the Periclean Age (15-17). He finds the spirit of revolt, criticism and discontent of our own day analogous to the spirit prevalent in the plays of Euripides.

How, then, are we to reconcile the rebel against tradition, determined to proclaim the truth and overthrow wrong and abuses, and the consummate artist who follows the traditions and conventions of his art, because by them alone he can be understood by his hearers? It is because these two elements, of the thinker and of the artist, are not harmoniously blended in him, as they are in Sophocles, that we have difficulty in understanding Euripides.

Of the nine compact chapters in the book six are devoted to an exposition of the political and intellectual atmosphere of fifth-century Athens, and of Euripides' expression of and criticism of that period. For he was both the child of his age, and in revolt against it.

The brief critical treatment of the myths, traditions and 'memories' of the poet, including the fragments of Satyrus recently unearthed in Egypt, is a model of its kind (20-58). In the third chapter (59-78) there is a good statement of the origin of tragedy and how its technical parts also are plainly derived from the old ritual of Dionysus. In a review of the early plays due comment is given to the lost play *Telephus*, so frequently parodied by Aristophanes. In his treatment of the Greek drama, Professor Murray never loses the modern point of view. But anthropology, cult studies and modern analogies are merely aids to his interpretation of Hellenic life. He is not only a student of books but knows human life and the passions of the heart. Hence the originality and freshness of his criticism of such great tragedies as the *Medea*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Ion* and the *Bacchae*.

All the great Greek philosophers, poets and thinkers were likewise men of action, taking their place in the strife of every-day life. Euripides was no exception to this rule. Though somewhat of a recluse, a reader of books and a stern critic of the errors and stupid conservatism of his time, he was for all that far more a man of action than most modern thinkers and men of letters. Herein is an important difference between the old Greeks and ourselves. Euripides was a true patriot and most sensitive to the mistakes and to the misfortunes of his beloved city. The varying events of the Peloponnesian War are reflected in his plays, and in his treatment of such subjects as slavery, marriage, and the oppression of the weak by the strong he was far in advance of his age.

In attempting to solve the 'riddle of the *Bacchae*' and the religious views of the poet (179-195), Professor Murray does not claim to say the last word. His belief in the poet's faith in man, when untrammelled by self-interest and convention, seems to be supported by the following quotation from the *Bacchae*, irrelevant though it is to the theme of that strange play:

As for knowledge I bear her no grudge; I take joy in the pursuit of her. But the other things <i. e. the other elements of existence> are great and shining. Oh, for life to flow toward that which is beautiful, till man through both light and darkness should be at peace and reverent, and, casting from him laws that are outside Justice, give glory to the gods!

The last two chapters on the Art of Euripides (196-243) are perhaps the most useful in the book. Within the stereotyped traditional form we have in Euripides, says Professor Murray, the living spirit, the note of sincerity, and the courage to face a situation and follow it to its consequences. The technical features of a play (prologue, messenger, *deus ex machina* and the chorus) are explained in a simple but illuminating manner. This book should be read by all classical teachers, and it is to be hoped that the clear and sympathetic exposition of these great plays will lead many to read them in the original.

Aristotle called Euripides 'the most tragic of the poets'. He has been studied and admired by the greatest poets of modern times. We may close by citing with Professor Murray Goethe's remark: 'Have all the nations of the world since his time produced one dramatist who was worthy to hand him his slippers?' Setting Shakespeare aside, can this dictum be contradicted?

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

H. S. SCRIBNER.

Studien zur älteren Athenischen Verfassungsgeschichte.

Von Artur Ledl. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung (1914). Pp. v + 422. 10 Marks.

A quarter of a century has elapsed since the discovery of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians* compelled scholars to subject their reconstruction of early Athenian history to a renewed scrutiny. The generation which so painfully emended obscure and broken places in the manuscript now faces the criticism of a younger generation which has studied the *Politeia* as a whole, without reference to the facsimile, and which is not misled by the glamor of a recent and unparalleled resurrection of a long lost manuscript.

Many questions, some of them new, are raised by Ledl's *Studies in the Constitutional History of Early Athens*. The book as a whole is divided into four sections. In the first, we have a rather disappointing chapter on the source-analysis. We are told that, for the period before the Persian Wars, Aristotle followed one main source, to which he here and there added facts acquired elsewhere. This source was identical with that used by Plutarch in his *Life of Solon*. The account of the 'Constitution of Draco' is an interpolation, but one made by Aristotle himself! The next chapter is devoted to an elaborate discussion of this constitution as given by Aristotle, and the following to a briefer study of the date of Cylon. The second section takes up in great detail the Attic king-lists. As introduction, we are led to study the mythical chronology of Herodotus. When this writer dates events so many years

'before my time', he is in reality using the era 488-487, which he has borrowed from one of his predecessors. Another main era is, not the Trojan War, but the generation after it, that is, 1288-1287. The list of Athenian kings is then traced through its different transformations, through Hellanicus, Castor, and the Parian Marble particularly, with much incidental reconstruction of the ancient authorities on chronology. Finally, we study the archons for life. The third section deals with the Solonian Council of the Four Hundred and the Areopagus, and the fourth with the various methods of selecting officials at Athens.

The book is in no sense popular. Long extracts in Greek, especially from the *Politeia*, fill its pages, and there is much in the text that we should expect to find in the notes. The discussion is carried into every corner where the slightest bit of information may be found, often to the detriment of the clear progress of the account, though some of these side-journeys furnish some of the most interesting results. There is no general summary at the end of the book and no attempt has been made to fit individual results into the general course of history. This is the more to be regretted in view of the manner in which treatment of the various events has been scattered. For example, the Draconian constitution is completed before page 76, the laws of Draco are in 290 ff., while an incidental reference on page 266 gives his status. The most necessary task of the reviewer is therefore the presentation of these general results.

Our present list of Erechthid rulers of Athens is late and much expanded. In its earliest form, it had but Cecrops, Erechtheus, Pandion, Aegeus, and Theseus. Its progressive expansion, in which doubling of rulers plays a large part, can easily be traced in the later literature. The list of post-Erechthid rulers began with Medon, for Melanthus and Codrus are not original, and the same may be said of the Alcmeonids, Megacles, Pheracles, and Alcmeon. Our earliest traditions show the Medontids to be kings. The archonship was established by 850 B.C. at the least, and existed side by side with the kingship. The Acastus oath was not taken by an archon of that name; rather it was the oath between the first archon and king Acastus. From the beginning, the archonship was annual, while the kingship, even after it had ceased to be more than the performance of certain religious rites, lasted for life. Only at a comparatively late time did the kingship become annual and elective. The list of Medontids is not official, as is that of the archons, which begins with 686. To join the two together, there were invented the ten-year archons, who are in no respect authentic. The polemarch is later than the archon and the thesmothetae are earlier than the end of the hereditary kingship. By unwritten law, the magistrates were always taken from the nobility, though elected by the shouts of the assembled folk. The single council was still formed by men of birth.

The revolt of Cylon is to be placed before the time of

Draco, the account given by Herodotus being a reading back into the past of the conditions of his own time. Draco was 'king' when he introduced his code of laws. The only fragment of these which was known to later times is the one preserved in the inscription of 409 B. C. The other laws lost their identity when incorporated in those of Solon.

The 'Constitution of Draco' is not authentic. It breaks the natural course of constitutional development; it rates the classes on a money basis; the strategus is the chief official of the state. Thus internal evidence shows that it cannot be earlier than the end of the fourth century. It was not known to Antiphon when he worked out the constitution of the Four Hundred in 412. The highly important pseudo-Xenophantic Constitution of the Athenians shows us that the same general sort of political ideas had been floating about for some time. A close date for its 'discovery' is given by the Draco inscription of 409, which shows renewed interest in that lawgiver. It was 'discovered' by Theramenes and his circle, not, however, near the end of Theramenes's life, but during the reaction of 411-410, and was to be used to prove that the compromise measure of that year was in reality modeled upon the 'Ancestral Constitution'.

In the place of the old single council, Solon established two, one for political and the other for judicial administration. The second was especially charged with murder cases. A relatively advanced stage had been reached by the Athenians in their treatment of murder, because they had already attempted to differentiate between the different types of homicide, while the Ionians had followed a false path in their development of money payment for such crimes. The origins of punishment for murder must be found in the judicial functions of king and council in early times. As in certain other periods of history, the oath must have been the decisive factor at this early date. Religious asylums, temples of refuge, must be postulated from the beginning. From these developed the custom whereby the court sat in different places for different types of the crime. The ephetae existed before Draco, as is shown by his failure to define fully their status. Officials were elected by vote of all the people until the time of Cleisthenes and the archons continued to be so chosen until 487.

The book is not in every respect beyond criticism. Source-analysis is frequent; sometimes it is a little too keen. Especially hardy seems the theory of interpolation by Aristotle himself. Let us take the case of chapter four, the account of the Draconian Constitution. Ledl assumes that it is a later insertion of its author. There is a passage in the *Politics* which expressly denies a constitution to Draco and Ledl admits its authenticity. He therefore must believe that the interpolation in the *Politeia* was made after both it and the *Politics* had been written. If, as seems fairly certain, the *Politeia* was simply a collection of material to be utilized in the preparation of the funda-

mental work, the Politics, then we must assume that Aristotle corrected the preparatory work and left the masterpiece untouched. Incidentally, it may be noted, one would never suspect from the Studies that the ascription to Aristotle had ever been questioned.

The whole period studied is one where very little is definitely known and, further, if we are to believe Ledl, very little was known when the great majority of our sources were written. This being so, our conclusions must be in most cases more or less dubious. Ledl recognizes this to a certain extent, but at times he has hardly shown sufficient caution when he places his theories in opposition to established sources. A considerable portion of the one hundred and fifty pages he has devoted to the Athenian king-lists simply narrates the story of learned error in antiquity. Study of certain of the chronological authorities used in this section has persuaded the reviewer that for this period they are entirely worthless. It seems strange in these days to have an elaborate discussion of the oriental chronology of Herodotus without a hint that native sources are now available and that these show this chronology to be largely baseless.

The most serious defect of the book is a certain provincial ignorance of the non-German secondary literature. While every scrap of Greek and Latin literature bearing on the subject is utilized and a small sized library of German authors is quoted, only one non-German work, de Sanctis's *Atthis*, is seriously and continuously quoted. There is passing mention of one Italian, four French, and three English studies, and Bonner's Evidence in Athenian Courts is used to prove an important point, though the American book has been consulted only at second hand. Ledl does not seem to have regularly worked through even the few periodicals in this list. For example, he has incidentally referred to Headlam's article in the fifth volume of *The Classical Review*, but there is no mention of those in the next, though, had he read them, he must certainly have referred to them, for instance, in connection with the ephetae. Constantly in reading the book we are tantalized by the memory of having seen a discussion on the point in some English work which is not quoted. A single case may be taken as typical. The most elaborate discussion of the date of Cylon is that by J. H. Wright in the third volume of *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Although Professor Wright was not the first to propound the view, the pre-Draconian date was then new to the point of heresy. To Ledl, the established date is pre-Draconian, and he seems never to feel that this is a comparatively new conception; so soon do we forget the history of our own study. Had the article of Professor Wright been more generally known, it is not likely that the post-Draconian theory would have been revived; certainly Ledl would not have needed another brief review of the evidence. Professor Wright's keen comparison between Plutarch's Life of Solon and the Politeia is known neither to Ledl nor to Adcocks, in his recent article in *Klio*.

The book has many acute suggestions, often however of a most hazardous nature when we consider the scantiness and untrustworthiness of the evidence. As to the originality of Ledl's conclusions, we must sometimes suspend judgment until we have again worked through the mass of non-German writers whose works our author has not seen fit to consult.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

A. T. OLMSTEAD.

In a popular lecture to the students of the University of Michigan on Convocation Day, October 6, 1914, on *The Nature and Purpose of Education*, Professor Victor C. Vaughan, Dean of the Department of Medicine and Surgery at that University since 1890, said, among other things (see *Science* for November 13, 1914, pages 691-692):

The study of Greek and Latin is a great factor in the comprehension of other languages partly derived from these. Moreover, one who is limited in his readings to translations, whether the original be in ancient or modern speech, loses much of the force, beauty and spirit of the author. It is true that there are translations which equal and a few which improve the originals. As one who has made scientific work his special endeavor during the entire period of his adult life, the speaker believes that the student who has never dug Greek roots nor pruned Latin stems has missed much in both pleasure and discipline. If a bit of personal experience be permitted, the speaker testifies that the first author to quicken the pyramidal cells of his cortex was Vergil, and today when recreation is sought the only book preferred to Vergil is Dryden's translation of the same.

While an educated man's linguistic ability may be limited to English, inability to read French and German handicaps him, delays acquaintance with important discoveries in various realms of knowledge, and limits his mental vision. To scientific workers a reading knowledge of French and German is quite essential. There are splendid nuggets of science and glittering gems of imagination encased in Italian, and sparkling jewels of humor encrusted in Spanish, but these, with many other languages, both ancient and modern, can hardly be placed in the list of educational essentials, however important they may be to the special student or for direct vocal intercourse.

From an article entitled *Getting Acquainted with Mr. Bryce*, by Mr. Elbert F. Baldwin, in *The Churchman* for September 19, 1914, comes the following quotation:

Mr. Bryce is strong on his Greek and Latin. He declares that the literature and institutions of Greece and Rome are the fountain heads of civilization. Moreover, the literatures of Greece and Rome better illustrate their history than do the more recent national literatures in connection with their respective histories. Finally, just as the political ideas of Greece and Rome were a point of departure for the modern world, so Greek and Latin authors have become the common stock of the thinkers and the writers of all modern countries. Hence, we should keep classical studies from declining. If we can do so during the next fifty years, the battle for their upholding will have been won.

There will be no issues of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* on December 26 and January 2.